



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/911,035	07/23/2001	Paul C. Davis	23	3476

7590 05/13/2003
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

VU, QUANG D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2811

DATE MAILED: 05/13/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action

Application No.

09/911,035

Applicant(s)

DAVIS, PAUL C.

Examiner

Quang D Vu

Art Unit

2811

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 23 April 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☒ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 35 USC 103(a) rejection for claims 3-5, 10-12, 30 and 31.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: _____

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
10. ☐ Other: _____

Steven Loke
Primary Examiner

Steven Loke

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Claims 1-2,6-9 and 13-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102 (e) as being anticipated by US Patent No. 6,225,674 to Lim et al. for the reason in record paper #8. Claims 17 and 26-29 are unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,225,674 to Lim et al. for the reason in record paper #8.

It is argued, in page 2 of the remark, that Lim et al. do not teach or suggest a conductive layer formed on a surface of the integrated circuit and operatively coupled to the isolation buried layer at a plurality of points spaced throughout the buried layer. This argument is not convincing because Lim et al. (figures 1-20) teach a conductive layer (112) formed on a surface of the integrated circuit and operatively coupled to the isolation buried layer (12) at a plurality of points spaced throughout the buried layer (12). Fig. 19 shows the conductive layer (112) is coupled to the left side and the right side of buried layer (12). The left and right side portions of layer (12) are spaced apart from each other. Therefore, the conductive layer (112) is operatively coupled to the isolation buried (12) at a plurality of points (left and right side portions of layer (12)) throughout the buried layer (12).

layer

It is argued, in pages 3 and 5 of the remark, that Lim et al. do not teach or suggest the conductive layer reducing an effective lateral resistance of the buried layer. This argument is not convincing because it is inherent that the conductive layer (112) reducing an effective lateral resistance of the isolation buried layer (12) since Lim et al. teach a conductive layer (112) formed on a surface of the integrated circuit and operatively coupled to the isolation buried layer (12) at a plurality of points spaced throughout the buried layer (12).

It is argued, in page 4 of the remark, that Lim et al. do not teach or suggest a semiconductor device formed on a semiconductor wafer. This argument is not convincing because it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made for a semiconductor device formed on a semiconductor wafer because the semiconductor wafer is a well known substance for manufacturing semiconductor device.

Claims 3-5 and 10-12 are objected. Claims 30 and 31 are allowed.